



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/521,724

08/16/2005

Laurentius Petrus Joseph Van Loon

0470-050128

1898

28289

7590

12/18/2007

THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C.
700 KOPPERS BUILDING
436 SEVENTH AVENUE
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219

EXAMINER

DINH, TIEN QUANG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3644

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/18/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/521,724

Applicant(s)

VAN LOON, LAURENTIUS
PETRUS JOSEPH

Examiner

Tien Dinh

Art Unit

3644

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 17-18, 21-22, and 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greiss 4055317 in view of Londeree et al 2854307 and/or Barrett 3848844.

Greiss discloses a galley on an aircraft with service trolleys 42 but is silent on the wall having modules that are slidable on the wall, slots on the wall, runners on the back of the modules, and lifting means. However, Londeree et al 2854307 discloses a module C, wall W, guides 26, 28 running in the vertical direction, mushroom shaped runners 46, 70 on the rear that can be hooked to the slots and undercut to the slots that are widened (this is where the runner can be inserted in the horizontal direction), and lifting means 40, 42 are well known. The examiner believe that Londeree et al teaches the undercut slots that have the t-shaped form with the slot forming the leg and the area behind the slot forming the top part of the T. Barrett also teaches undercuts that have T-shapes to allow elements to slide in the slots.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a module, wall, guides running in the vertical direction, mushroom shaped runners on the rear that can be hooked to the slots and undercut to the slots that are widened (this is where the runner can be inserted in the horizontal direction), and lifting means in Greiss' system as

taught by Londeree et al and/or Barrett to accommodate the passengers. It would have been obvious to have used undercuts with T shapes in Greiss' system as taught by Londeree et al and/or Barrett to allow the modules to slide up and down the slots.

Re claims 24 and 25, the examiner takes official notice that locking means to fix the modular at a specific height is well known and one skilled in the art would have used such locking means to allow crew members of different height to access it.

Re claim 26, the examiner takes official notice that connecting means for data exchange/power are well know and one skilled in the art would have used such devices to provide data/power to the crew.

Re claim 27, please note that the use of multiple vertical sections. This way there can be multiple modules being used.

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greiss 4055317 as modified by Londeree et al 2854307 and/or Barrett as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Chalabian 4067477.

Greiss 4055317 as modified by Londeree et al 2854307 and/or Barrett discloses all claimed parts except for the widened section of a slot. However, Chalabian discloses that widened sections 250 of slots are well known.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used widened parts of the slots in Greiss' system as modified by Londeree et al and/or

Barrett and as taught by Chalabian to have the predictable result of have more places to attach the modules into the slots.

Re claim 20, since the widened part of the slots are inherently above the floor of the galley when the prior arts are combined, modules (such as a big one) that are placed on floor would be in front of the undercut slot. This module would inherently completely overlap the widened section. Plus, since Greiss et al teaches that modules that are on the floor of the galley as shown, one skilled in the art would have used a widened section nearer to the floor to have the predictable result of lowering and raising the modules in these galleys so as to reduce lifting by the crew. Plus, this would be easier to install the modules.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greiss 4055317 as modified by Londeree et al 2854307 and/or Barrett, as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Nervig et al 6454208.

Greiss 4055317 as modified by Londeree et al 2854307 and/or Barrett discloses all claimed parts except for the spindle with arms that moves by internal screw thread. Nervig et al discloses this deficiency in figures 3 and 4.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used spindles with internal screw threads in Greiss' system as modified by Londeree et al as taught by Nervig et al as a substitution of parts.

Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rader 5063859 in view of Londeree et al 2854307 and/or Barrett.

Rader discloses a train but is silent on the claimed modular galley. However, Londeree et al 2854307 discloses a module C, wall W, guides 26, 28 running in the vertical direction, mushroom shaped runners 46, 70 on the rear that can be hooked to the slots and undercut to the slots that are widened (this is where the runner can be inserted in the horizontal direction), and lifting means 40, 42 are well known. The examiner believe that Londeree et al teaches the undercut slots that have the t-shaped form with the slot forming the leg and the area behind the slot forming the top part of the T. Barrett also teaches undercuts that have T-shapes to allow elements to slide in the slots.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a module, wall, guides running in the vertical direction, mushroom shaped runners on the rear that can be hooked to the slots and undercut to the slots that are widened (this is where the runner can be inserted in the horizontal direction), and lifting means in Rader' system as taught by Londeree et al and/or Barrett to accommodate the passengers. It would have been obvious to have used undercuts with T shapes in Greiss' system as taught by Londeree et al and/or Barrett to allow the modules to slide up and down the slots.

Re claim 33, the examiner takes official notice that data bus is well known and one skilled in the art would have used data bus to computerize or automate the modular galley. Applicant has not argued this, hence this is admitted prior art.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greiss 4055317 as modified by Londeree et al 2854307 and/or Barrett and further in view of Chalabian 4067477.

Greiss 4055317 as modified by Londeree et al 2854307 and/or Barrett discloses all claimed parts except for the widened section of a slot. See above. However, Chalabian discloses that widened sections 250 of slots are well known.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used widened parts of the slots in Greiss' system as modified by Londeree et al and/or Barrett and as taught by Chalabian to have the predictable result of have more places to attach the modules into the slots. Since the widened part of the slots are inherently above the floor of the galley when the prior arts are combined, modules (such as a big one) that are placed on floor would be in front of the undercut slot. This module would inherently completely overlap the widened section. Plus, since Greiss et al teaches that modules that are on the floor of the galley as shown, one skilled in the art would have used a widened section nearer to the floor to have the predictable result of lowering and raising the modules in these galleys so as to reduce lifting by the crew. Plus, this would be easier to install the modules.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/4/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Please note that "hook" seems to suggest that by merely being capable of sliding within undercut slot that an object is essentially "hooked". This is clearly described in Londeree et al. His runners are hooked in the undercut slots. Please note that figure 1 shows that the slots 28

with space behind panel 25 also. Please also note that language of the claims is intended use too. The runners of Londeree et al are very capable of hooking into the undercut slots. Barrett also teaches undercuts with runners that have widened parts.

The new rejection renders applicant's arguments moot.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tien Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-6899. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 571-272-7045. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number:
10/521,724
Art Unit: 3644

Page 8

TD

Tan 2046